UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/047,784	01/14/2002	Kevin S. Barker	RSW920010051US1	5069

48816 7590 11/17/2005		EXAMINER	
VAN LEEUWEN & VAN LEEUWEN		RUTTEN, JAMES D	
P.O. BOX 90609			
AUSTIN, TX 78709-0609	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	2192		

DATE MAILED: 11/17/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/047,784	BARKER ET AL.
	Examiner	**Art Unit**	
	J. Derek Rutten	2192	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 August 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-16 and 18-28* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-16 and 18-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/28/05*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to Applicant's amendment dated 22 August 2005, responding to
the 14 January 2005 Office action provided in the rejection of claims 1-25, wherein claims 1, 8,
15, 22, 23, and 25 have been amended, claims 3 and 17 have been canceled, and new claims 26-
28 have been added. Claims 1, 2, 4-16, and 18-28 remain pending in the application and have
been fully considered by the examiner.

2.   Applicant's arguments filed 22 August 2005 have been fully considered. Applicant has
primarily argued that the references fail to teach all the elements of the claims. These arguments
are not persuasive, and are addressed below.

3.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this
Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).
Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE
MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO
MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after
the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period
will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37
CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Response to Amendment

4.   The prior drawing objections and the rejection under 35 USC 112 1st paragraph have been

withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendment. However, a new rejection under 35 USC 112 is

made with further description below.

Response to Arguments

5.   Applicant's arguments filed 22 August 2005 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

6.   On pages 15 and 16, Applicant argues that neither the Sun WBEM nor Tett references

teach or suggest "replacing the retrieved name with the qualifier value prior to the displaying."

However, upon further review of the originally filed specification, no support for this limitation

could be found. Therefore, a new rejection under 35 USC 112 is made with further description

below. However, even if the specification did provide support, the features are taught by the

combination of references. Sun WBEM discloses that qualifier values are displayed (page 44

"Qualifiers Dialog Box"). Qualifier values are retrieved in association with qualifiers of classes,

instances, properties, and methods (page 28 "Viewing Qualifiers"). In order to retrieve the

qualifier value, an associated retrieved name of such classes, instances, properties and methods

must first be present otherwise there would be no way to find the correct value. Once the value

has been retrieved, it is displayed. Sun WBEM does not teach *replacing* one with the other prior

to displaying. However, Tett teaches that replacing a string, or name, with a second string, or

value, is advantageous when the second string conveys more meaning to the viewer (Tett column

1 lines 45-50). Thus, while Tett does not specifically address replacing a *retrieved name* with a

qualifier value, Tett is not relied upon for supplying the retrieved name or the qualifier value.

Since these limitations are interpreted as being data elements intended for display, Tett's

disclosure of replacing text intended for display is used to teach "replacing", which is missing

from Sun WBEM. Thus, the act of "replacing the retrieved name with the qualifier value" is

made obvious by the teaching of Tett, and all limitations have been addressed.

7.   Applicant further argues that Tett is nonanalogous art and there would be no motivation

to combine (page 17). However, both Sun WBEM and Tett are involved in the display of

information. While their supporting technologies may be different, it is not the supporting

technologies that require combination, but the teachings of the display of meaningful

information. In paragraph 3 on page 17, Applicant has requested that an analogy be made in

order to clarify the nature of the references. One simple analogy might be the display of public

information (signs, information desks, maps, etc.) in an airport as opposed to similar displays in

a zoo. An airport is a very different operation from a zoo, but both establishments are interested

in the display of meaningful information to the public. While one would not go to an airport to

learn about the proper care of animals, one could readily learn about the display and access of

public information in an airport that might be provide valuable teaching for similar displays in a

zoo. They do not have to share the same internal structure in order to teach the other about the

meaningful display of information. Since both Sun WBEM and Tett have an interest in the

efficient display of meaningful information, they qualify as analogous art with respect to the

display of information. And since Tett teaches a more meaningful display of information, one would be motivated to combine it with Sun WBEM.

8.   In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

Information Disclosure Statement

9.   The information disclosure statement filed 28 February 2005 fails to comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609 because the documents corresponding to citations AF-AI were not found and the document numbers appear to be incorrect. Further, page 72 of citation AQ by Schmidt is illegible. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered as to the merits. Applicant is advised that the date of any re-submission of any item of information contained in this information disclosure statement or the submission of any missing element(s) will be the date of submission for purposes of determining compliance with the requirements based on the time of filing the statement, including all certification requirements for statements under 37 CFR 1.97(e). See MPEP § 609.05(a).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

11.   Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over prior art of

record "WBEM on Sun Developer's Guide" by Sun Microsystems, Inc. (hereinafter "Sun

WBEM") in view of prior art of record U.S. Patent 5,635,918 to Tett (hereinafter "Tett").

In regard to claim 1, Sun WBEM discloses:

A method (page 25: "Navigating in CIM WorkShop") *of generating display*

names for management definition data elements, said method comprising:

receiving an element identifier See bottom of page 25:

> When you first start CIM WorkShop, the classes of the CIM Schema display hierarchically in the left side of the CIM WorkShop window. This arrangement of classes is referred to as the class inheritance tree. When you **select a class**, its associated properties are listed in the right side of the window.

The element is identified upon selection.

retrieving a non-instance name from a management data definition in response to

determining that an element corresponding to the element identifier is a non-instance

element; A class, as cited above at the bottom of page 25, is inherently a non-instance

element, as it is merely the abstract definition of any particular instance.

retrieving an instance name from the management data definition in response to

determining that the element corresponding to the element identifier is an instance

element; See bottom of page 36:

> If the selected class has instances, the instances are displayed in the left frame of the Instances
> window.

displaying the retrieved name on a display device. As cited above.

locating a qualifier corresponding to the retrieved name; reading a qualifier

value corresponding to the qualifier; See page 44: "Qualifiers Dialog Box".

Sun WBEM does not expressly disclose *replacing a retrieved name with the*

qualifier value prior to the displaying. However, in an analogous environment, Tett

teaches replacing one string, or name, with another. See column 1 lines 59-63:

> The received message is translated into a second message using a predefined dictionary
> associated with the wireless receiver device to which the message is to be sent. After
> translation, the message is then sent to the wireless receiver device.

Note that the message is translated, or "replaced", prior to display on the wireless

receiver device. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time

the invention was made to use Tett's teaching of string replacement with Sun WBEM's

name retrieval. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to provide a string in a

meaningful form for a user (See Tett column 2 lines 22-24) so that a user would be able

to easily understand it.

In regard to claim 2, the above rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Sun WBEM

further discloses: *wherein the management data definition includes a common*

information model managed object format file. See page 5: "Managed Object Format"

In regard to claim 4, the above rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Sun WBEM does not expressly disclose a translation file or replacement of translated strings. However, Tett teaches: *searching a translation file for a translated string that corresponds to the retrieved name; and replacing the retrieved name with the translated string prior to the displaying.* See column 4 lines 40-67. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use Tett's teaching of string replacement with Sun WBEM's name retrieval. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to provide a string in the native language of a user (Tett column 2 lines 22-24) so that a user would be able to easily understand it.

In regard to claim 5, the above rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claim 1.

In regard to claim 6, the above rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. Sun WBEM further discloses: *identifying a plurality of properties corresponding to the element identifier; retrieving a plurality of values, wherein each of the values corresponds with one of the properties; and writing each of the properties followed by the value corresponding to the property to the retrieved name.* See page 28: "Viewing Class Properties".

In regard to claim 7, the above rejection of claim 1 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claim 6.

In regard to claim 8, Sun WBEM discloses a system for execution using the Sun Solaris operating environment (page 11) which requires processors, memory, and nonvolatile storage for execution. Sun WBEM further discloses a display name tool (page 23: "CIM Workshop"). All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claim 1.

In regard to claims 9 and 12-14, the above rejection of claim 8 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claim 2 and 5-7, respectively.

In regard to claims 10 and 11, the above rejection of claim 8 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 1 and 4, respectively.

In regard to claim 15, Sun WBEM discloses:

A computer program product (page 13 "Shared Packages"). All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claim 1.

In regard to claim 16 and 19-21, the above rejection of claim 15 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 2 and 5-7, respectively.

In regard to claim 17 and 18, the above rejection of claim 15 is incorporated. All further limitations have been addressed in the above rejection of claims 1 and 4, respectively.

In regard to claim 22, all limitations have been addressed in the above rejections of claim 1.

In regard to claim 23, all limitations have been addressed in the above rejections of claims 1 and 6.

In regard to claim 24, all limitations have been addressed in the above rejections of claims 1, 4, and 8.

In regard to claim 25, all limitations have been addressed in the above rejections of claims 1, 2, and 15.

12.   Claims 26 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun WBEM in view of "Common Information Model (CIM) Specification" (hereinafter "CIM

Specification") by Distributed Management Task Force, Inc. (hereinafter "CIM Specification"),

in view of "DMTF Core CIM v2.3 LDAP Mapping" (hereinafter "CIM Mapping", also by

Distributed Management Task Force, Inc.

In regard to claim 26, Sun WBEM discloses:

A computer-implemented method comprising: identifying a data element in a

model of a managed system; constructing a display name for the data elements (See

above rejection of claim 1). While disclosing the identification of elements and

construction of element display names, Sun WBEM does not expressly describe "pre-

defined display names". However, in an analogous environment, *CIM Specification*

teaches *determining if a pre-defined display name is associated with the data element*

wherein the pre-defined display name is a qualifier value associated with the data

element; in response to a determination that a display name is associated with the data

element, constructing the display name from the pre-defined display name; See *CIM*

Specification, top of page 16:

QUALIFIER	DEFAULT	APPLIES TO	TYPE	MEANING
DISPLAYNAME	NULL	Any	STRING	Defines a name that will be displayed on UI instead of the actual name of the element.

This section of the reference displays a list of standard qualifiers that all CIM-compliant

implementations are required to handle. Among the list is the *DISPLAYNAME* qualifier,

which is used to display a name on the UI (user interface) in place of the actual element

name.

>*determining if the data element corresponds to an instance in the system model;*

See Sun WBEM, bottom of page 36:

>> If the selected class has instances, the instances are displayed in the left frame of the
>> Instances window.

>*in response to a determination that the data element corresponds to an instance in*

the system model and that no pre-defined display name is associated with the data

element, constructing the display name from one or more... key properties associated

with the data element; See *CIM Specification* page 53:

>> The model path is specified for object and association differently. For objects (instances
>> of classes), the model path is the combination of property value pairs that are marked
>> with the KEY qualifier. So the model path for the following is:
>> "ex_sampleClass.label1=9921,label2=8821".

and displaying the display name on a display device. See Sun WBEM bottom of page

36:

>> If the selected class has instances, the instances are displayed in the left frame of the
>> Instances window.

Sun WBEM and the *CIM Specification* does not expressly disclose using *non-*

propagated key properties to construct the name. However, in an analogous

environment, *CIM Mapping* teaches the use of non-propagated keys in providing naming

considerations. See top of page 7:

>> If the DIT structure follows the CIM namespace structure, orderedCimKeys is used and
>> **does not include propagated keys.**

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to use *CIM Mapping*'s teaching of non-propagated keys with the *CIM*

Specification's teaching of naming using key properties with Sun WBEM's name display.

One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to facilitate efficient and unique naming

of model elements (See CIM Specification, section 5 item 1 on page 45).

In regard to claim 28, All further limitations have been addressed in the above

rejection of claims 15 and 26, above.

13.   Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun WBEM,

CIM Specification, and CIM Mapping as applied to claim 26 above, and further in view of Tett.

In regard to claim 27, Sun WBEM does not expressly disclose: *determining if a*

pre-defined display name in a designated natural language is associated with the data

element. However, in an analogous environment, Tett teaches replacing one string, or

name, with another. See column 1 lines 59-63, and column 2 lines 22-24. One of

ordinary skill would have been motivated to provide a string in a meaningful form for a

user (See Tett column 2 lines 22-24) so that a user would be able to easily understand it.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to J. Derek Rutten whose telephone number is (571) 272-3703. The

examiner can normally be reached on T-F 6:00 - 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571) 272-3695. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jdr

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER